

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 15-25 are pending in this application. In the last Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-6 remain allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing those claims. The Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for “failing to comply with the written description requirement.” Claims 15-20 were rejected as obvious over Bain et al. (US 5,287,434) in view of Lobiondo (US 5,287,194). The Examiner rejected claims 21-25 as anticipated by Bain et al. Claims 16 and 21 have been amended.

Regarding the Examiner’s § 112 rejection of claim 15, Applicants respectfully submit that the application complies with the written description requirement. As support for the phrase “wherein the status recovered by the recovery means is the status previous to the status at the time of the failure,” see the specification from, for example, page 132 to page 154. Specifically, page 154, lines 1-4 state: “If any failure arises during the scheduling of jobs, the recovery processing section 412e recovers the previous state of each of jobs retained in the plurality of queues at the time of recovery from the failure.” Because the application fully complies with § 112, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is not obvious because the cited references at least do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed “recovery means for recovering the status of each of the jobs being held in the plurality of queues, at the time of recovery from a failure, if any failure occurred while the jobs are being scheduled by said scheduling means, wherein the status recovered by the recovery means is the status previous to the status at the time of the failure.” The Examiner asserts that column 15, lines 1-20 of Bain et al. teach changing “the processing status of the print

job at the time of failure to a waiting status. A waiting status is a state previous to a processing state because it is waiting to be processed.” While the Examiner may be correct that “[a] waiting status is a state previous to a processing state,” the claim requires that “the status recovered by the recovery means is the status previous to the status at the time of the failure.” Thus, the claim does not allow the recovered status to be any previous status, but instead “the status previous to the status at the time of the failure.” Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claim 15.

Applicants have amended claim 16. This amendment traverses the Examiner’s § 103 rejection based on Bain et al. and Lobiondo because these references, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest an “attribute modifying means for modifying the attribute information … wherein the attribute information is chosen from at least one of paper size, tray number, and the availability of double-sided printing.” This amendment does not add new matter. See the specification at page 14, lines 19-21 (“print attributes (hereinafter referred to as attribute information) consisting of a paper size, a tray number, and the availability of double-sided printing”). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and the allowance of claim 16. For at least the same reasons, claims 17-20 are patentable due to their dependence on claim 16.

Like claim 16, claim 21 has been amended to require that “the attribute information is chosen from at least one of paper size, tray number, and the availability of double-sided printing.” As discussed above, the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest this limitation. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection

and allowance of claim 21. For at least the same reasons, claims 22-25 are patentable due to their dependence on claim 21.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 3, 2004

By: Jason E. Stach
Jason E. Stach
Reg. No. 54,464